REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated August 15, 2006, claims 1-12 were pending and rejected in this application.

CLAIMS 1-12 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY POLONSKY ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 7,072,984 (HEREINAFTER POLONSKY)

On pages 2-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Polonsky discloses the invention corresponding to that claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The factual determination of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure, either explicitly or inherently, of each element of a claimed invention in a single reference.[1] As part of this analysis, the Examiner must (a) identify the elements of the claims, (b) determine the meaning of the elements in light of the specification and prosecution history, and (c) identify corresponding elements disclosed in the allegedly anticipating reference.[2] This burden has not been met.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, "a plurality of row range views, a plurality of row views, each of said row views having an association with one of said row range views." To teach the plurality of row range views, the Examiner asserted that column 19, lines 10-14 of

[1] In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993); Lindermann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984).
[2] Lindermann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

Polonsky identically discloses these features. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion.

Column 19, lines 10-14 refers to the template normalizer 84 in Fig. 2 of Polonsky. As described therein, the template normalizer 84 takes documents and normalizes the documents. The specific discussion found in column 19, lines 10-14 describes that the template normalizer 84 is capable of dealing with different documents, regardless of whether or not the documents includes a data table having a various number of columns and rows or no data table at all. This passage, however, is completely silent as to a plurality of row range views. The Examiner's statement of the rejection does not construe a meaning for row range views or establish how Polonsky teaches a plurality of row range views.

Regarding the claimed "a plurality of row views, each of said row views having an association with one of said row range views " the Examiner cited column 21, lines 63-67 of Polonsky. Although Applicants recognize that Fig. 12 of Polonsky shows the broad concept of rows, the Examiner has failed to establish that the teachings in Polonsky cited by the Examiner have any relationship with the asserted "row range views." As recited in claim 1, these row views have an association with "one of said row range views." Not only has the Examiner failed to establish that the alleged row views in Fig. 12 have an association with one of the alleged row range views (i.e., the disclosure in column 19, lines 10-14 of Polonsky), the Examiner has failed to establish the alleged row views in Fig. 12 have any association with the alleged row range views. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish that Polonsky identically discloses the entirety of this limitation within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 1 further recites "a plurality of record views, each of said record views having an association with one of said row views," for which the Examiner cited column 22, lines 56-57 of Polonsky to identically disclose. A review of this passage, however, yields no such teaching. The Examiner has failed to establish that the code disclosed in column 22, lines 56-57 constitutes "a plurality of record views" given the ordinary and customary meaning attributed to the term "view" by one having ordinary skill in the art. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to establish that these alleged "record views" have an association with one of the alleged row views (i.e., column 21, lines 63-67). Therefore, the Examiner further fails to establish that Polonsky identically discloses the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Still further, claim 1 recites "a complex table processor coupled to an application server and programmed to reduce a complex table into said row range views, said row views and said record views," and the Examiner cited column 21, lines 46-60 to teach the claimed complex table processor. However, this passage is silent with regard to reducing the complex table into the row range views, the row view, and the record views. Polonsky does not teach reducing the complex table in row range views. Instead Polonsky teaches using "[t]able pattern recognition" to look for tables "that conform to some of the more common uses of the tables for data presentation." This pattern recognition uses "weighting and comparison of table cell nodes … to determine the order in which to extract cell data." The table is then normalized as described throughout Polonsky. As such, Polonsky further fails to identically disclose the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 3 and 8

Independent claims 3 and 8 recite, in part, the step of "reducing a complex table defined in markup to a row range view, a set of row views and a set of record views." Applicants incorporate herein, as also applying to claims 3 and 8, the arguments previously presented above with regard to Polonsky failing to identically disclose the claimed row range view.

Regarding the Examiner's citation of column 17, lines 40-43 to teach the claimed "navigably linking ..." steps, Applicants note this passage refers to the "trees of documents" and "list of links, table, image." However, absent from this passage are teachings regarding the claimed "record views," "row views," and "row range view." Thus, the Examiner further fails to establish that Polonsky identically discloses the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 7 and 12

Claims 7 and 12 also include the concepts of ranges of rows, and as already argued above, the Examiner has failed to establish that Polonsky identically discloses this feature. Applicants, therefore, submit that Polonsky fails to identically disclose these claims within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Polonsky is not factually viable and, hence, solicit withdrawal thereof.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Although Applicants believe that all claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is directed to the following statement found in M.P.E.P. § 706(II):

> When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible should offer a definite suggestion for correction.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: November 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/
Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984
Steven M. Greenberg
Registration No. 44,725
CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320